Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), Air Permits Division
Thermoset Resin Standard Air Permit
December 7, 2009
Austin

Minutes

I. Opening Remarks .....Becky Southard, *Rules Development*
Ms. Southard discussed the reason for the stakeholder meeting and reviewed the reasons behind the delays in the standard permit project.

II. Historical Background ..... Eddie Mack, *New Source Review Permitting*
Mr. Mack reviewed the reasons that the thermoset resin permit by rule (PBR) needs to be replaced and provided some history behind the styrene limits. Mr. Mack stated that the 1998 United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) emission factors were underestimated. Mr. Mack mentioned that there would be no fugitive emissions under the proposed standard permit.

III. Styrene Effects Screening Level (ESL) .....Manny Reyna, *Toxicology Division*
Mr. Reyna discussed the ESL review process for styrene and described the scientific study and data that was used to come up with the current level of 110 micrograms per cubic meter.

IV. Draft Standard Permit .....Becky Southard, *Rules Development*
Ms. Southard reviewed the technical differences between the current draft standard permit and the version that the stakeholder group last commented on in the summer of 2007.

V. Discussion Topics ..... Open Discussion

A. *Concerns about the ESL's impact on the thermoset resin industry and the economy*

Chris Johnston of L.F. Manufacturing, Inc, expressed concerns that the ESL was inappropriate during a decline in the economy and would impact the thermoset resin industry greatly. Wendell Hollingsworth of Fibergrate stated that the standard permit as it was written would take away a competitive edge over facilities located in other states or other countries.

Staff described the ESL review process and noted that it was a separate process from the development of the standard permit that had a separate notice and comment period.

B. *The styrene ESL*

Jack Benton of Benton and Associates stated that the ESL is lower than EPA's recommended limit and other states such as California. He also expressed concern over businesses moving their locations to other states or other countries. John

Schweitzer from the American Composites Manufacturing Association (ACMA) stated that few current thermoset facilities would qualify for the proposed standard permit based on their calculations. He also added that an ESL based on odor instead of health would prohibit economic development in Texas.

Mr. Reyna reiterated that the ESL study was based on sound scientific research. He stated that the Toxicology Division has been receiving high praise from EPA, other states, and Canada about the process they used in determining the limit. Mr. Mack reminded Mr. Schweitzer that the standard permit would not be the only form of preconstruction authorization available to the industry, and although a standard permit is designed in an attempt to incorporate as many varied kinds of facilities possible, it will never encompass all of them.

C. ***ESL and public complaints***

Joe Wiegand of Containment Solutions was curious about the connection between public complaints and the potential repeal of the thermoset resin PBR.

Mr. Reyna stated that there were no more odor complaints than usual. Mr. Mack reiterated the basis for starting the creation of the standard permit. Ms. Southard also noted that the agency has a responsibility to property owners of the state of Texas. These property owners experiencing nuisance odors may or may not have filed a formal complaint.

D. ***The Toxicology Division's odor study used for styrene's ESL***

Mr. Schweitzer and other stakeholders suggested that the agency use a different study to determine styrene's ESL. Mr. Schweitzer indicated that he approved of a study done by Pamela Dalton. He stated that he has had meetings with Michael Honeycutt in the Toxicology Division and has submitted the suggestion to use this study to replace the one that was used.

E. ***Using a case-by-case permit instead of the proposed standard permit***

Stakeholders expressed concerns that facilities can't afford to wait for the time it takes to receive a case-by-case preconstruction permit. They expressed a preference for the TCEQ to make an updated permit by rule instead of a new standard permit.

Mr. Mack stated that the Air Permits Division has nothing to gain by slowing down the permitting process and that many case-by-case permits can be completed as quickly as three months as long as the original application is thorough and complete. Mr. Mack also emphasized that the standard permit is the best fit in order to include as many types of thermoset facilities as possible in a way that appropriately limits emissions.

F. ***Acetone limits***

Rodney Vickers of Royal Baths expressed a concern that the acetone limitation in the proposed standard permit was too low. Other stakeholders expressed similar support for the ability to use more acetone as it is a valuable component of the industry.

Mr. Mack warned that acetone may be useful in removing resin, but it poses a safety concern due to its flammability and toxicity.

G. ***Stack requirement***

Mr. Schweitzer stated that the cost of putting in a stack can be as much as $250,000 due to the rising cost in steel, which is typically more than the total cost of most thermoset resin operations.

Staff stated that the requirement to install a stack is a reasonable control for the industry type.

VI. Milestones for the Standard Permit Project ..... Becky Southard, *Rules Development*

- **Comments Due: January 7, 2010**
- **Public Hearing: May, 2010**
- **Agenda: November, 2010**

VII. Closing Remarks/Action Items ..... Open Discussion

Staff reminded stakeholders that written comments could be submitted until close of business on January 7, 2010.